

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Pursuant to the requirement of 37 C.F.R. 1.121, please substitute and replace all the claim sheets, as amended and as originally filed, with the above amended set of claims. The following claim rejections were noted from the Office Action dated June 28, 2007 and pursuant to each paragraph, presented in the same order, arguments follow.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite.

Claim 10 has been amended to clarify the confusion between the first and second dressing components. Therefore, the rejection has been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Liao et al. (USPN 6,932,076).

Liao discloses a “circular steel blade 20 having an axle bore and a plurality of arc-shape copper alloy metal sheet 200...each arc-shape copper alloy metal steel 200 includes a plurality of openings 200a, which provide the space required to accommodate a plurality of diamond particles.”

In response to claim 1 rejection, claim 1 has been amended to remove the feature “copper.” Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Liao.

Since claim 1 is now patentable, dependent claims 2 to 7 are also patentable and should be allowed.

Applicant noted that in the Office Action dated June 28, 2007, it was stated "*Liao teaches the grinding wheel further comprises additional dressing wheel components...(The examiner notes that each flat tip 200 is considered to be a dressing wheel component that is adjacent to and surrounding the interrupted cutting outer surfaces 200a)*" A plurality of flat tips 200 has been compared with the dressing wheel component in claim 1 as "a plurality of tips." Since a plurality of flat tips 200 may be considered a dressing wheel component, it should not be considered as an additional component. Therefore, using an existing component against our additional component as it is disclosed in the instant claim 2 or claim 3 can not be proper. In addition, it is clear that Liao does not disclose any additional components including flat grinding surfaces.

Similarly, Liao does not disclose a first dressing wheel component including at least one interrupted cutting outer surface and a second dressing wheel component including a flat grinding surface as claimed in claim 9. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Liao reference does not anticipate claim 9 because Liao does not teach each and every element of claim 9.

Since claim 9 is patentable, the dependent claims 10-11 and 13-15 are also

patentable and should be allowed.

In order to expedite the prosecution, Applicant wishes to request a telephone interview before Examiner issues an Office Action in response to this amendment.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination, and hopes, that by these amendments and arguments, the subject matter of the present invention is now more clearly stated. The argument provides a closer review of the present invention and gives solid support for an allowance. Consequently, Applicant requests the Examiner's reconsideration in the instant Application and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection in view of the arguments.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now distinguish over the prior art and are allowable. For the reasons discussed above, it is believed that this Application is now in an allowable condition such that it is appropriate to hereby respectfully solicit its allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven G. Smarsh
CARGILL & ASSOCIATES, P.L.L.C. - #25686

/Lynn E. Cargill 31598/
Lynn E. Cargill
Registration No. 31,598
56 Macomb Place
Mt. Clemens, MI 48043-5636
Phone: 586-465-6600
Email: Cargillpatents@usa.net

Date: Nov. 28, 2007

C:\TruTechP-305\112807OAResp